App. F. IX-4

Previous References

193 2-3
(Muz)

File No. 139-3

Serial Nos. 1-3,5

Later References

Muz 76-33 (1-5)
139 34-7
Muz 170-36-1-6
[illegible] 03-37-3
Law Dep No. 7/42

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 1-3, 5-7

Part B for ~~Feb~~ 1932

SUBJECT.

Appeal preferred against the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner in the matter of the change of patta of certain S. Nos of Bannerghatta Village, Anekal Taluk, from the name of the Archak to the names of Sri [illegible] alias Dharmaswami

No. 769 d/ 27-12-32 to the Advocate for the petitioner.

Rejecting the petition

4.0 4/2

Muz appl 5 of 32-33

General and Revenue Secretariat

Muz File No. 139 of 1932-3

[App. F. III—2

Serial No.

1

Petition of 17-8-32 filed by Mr. V. R. Vasudeva Sastri Advocate Bangalore City on behalf of his client [illegible] of Sri Champakadhama Swami Temple at Bannerghatta appealing against the decision of the Muzrai Commissioner in Muz appl 5 of 31-32 on the file of his court re: S. Nos 97. 176, 178 214, 221, 224 & 32 of Bannerghatta Village - Jigani Hobli - Anekal Taluk.

Vide entries against No. 280. page 120 of the printed Register of Muzrai Institutions endowed with Inam lands in the Anekal Tq. Sri Champakadhama Swami alias Ramaswami at Bannerghatta is found endowed with Inam. Old Fdr No 19 Vol.

S. Nos 97, 176, 178, 214, 221, 229 & 32 of the Bannerghatta Village refd to in para 1 (a) P. and are not found in the Reg.

The appeal petn is sufficiently stamped & presented in time. The orders of the appeal may be admitted, records called for & collected from the Inam Registers obtained from the Supdt Rev-Survey & Settlement (Inam Dept).

The records may be called for

No 1191 2/9/32

27/

For Secy

T. Member

FILED ... THE COUNCIL 1932 No. 1608

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

GOVD 70—GBP VI—60,000—13-8-3

Office filed. ~~forwards~~ Acknowledgement of the Petitioner is for his Signature -

Sd/ 10/9

Inc 9
12/9/32

TYPING SECTN.
12 SEP. 1932
GENL. & REV. SECTT.

No 470 of 19.9.32 to the Muzrai Commissioner Calling for records connected with the appeal - 2

No 471 of 19.9.32 to the Superintendent Revenue Survey and Settlement Calling for extracts of Inam Registers in respect of the lands specified therein. 3

Acknowledgement No 472 of 19.9.32 to ~~Messrs~~ R. Vasudeva Sastri and S. Anjananeya Rao acknowledging ~~the~~ receipt of the petition referred to them - 4

Dr 19/9

No 126 of 24.9.32 from the Superintendent Revenue Survey and Settlements forwarding Copy of the Inam Register pertaining to the grant of lands to Sri Champaka-dhama Swami at Bannerghatta Anekal Taluk. 5

It is seen from the extract that only the wet land appears to have been endowed with a Beriz of Rs 5/- & this is given for puja to Sri Ramaswami deity of the place -

Muz Appl. 5 of

General and Revenue Secretariat

Muz File No. 139 of 193 2 3

[App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
	11) The receipt of records from the D.C. is awaited. G.S. [illegible] Infd [illegible] 4/12/32
6	Letter no 316/32-33 d 25/11/32 from the Muzrai Commissioner submitting the file of records received with the Bangalore Deputy Commissioner's letter No 1140/32-33 d 12/11/32 together with his office record No Appl 5/31-32.
	12) Vide flag R. for the copy of the decision (given by the M.C.) annexed to the records received from the D.C. Office. The records in original indicating that the lands in question ~~are~~ were service Inam lands at the outset & that they were later on [illegible] during Tippu Sultan's time & were levied with full assessment & that later on in June 1877 a proposal was made that the Khata of the lands should be made in the name of the deity etc. are not received with the papers now received. D.O. calling for these & such other old records on the subject [illegible] G.S. (11) — ? (12) Not necessary - the file sent contains all necessary info. 12/12 The appellant has evidently no case. The order appealed [illegible]

Note—Contn. Sheet.

appl 5 of 32-33

File No. 139 of 1932

eter
Sec

is one passed by the present II Member of Council when he was Muzrai Commr. Orders are solicited re date of hearing.

12/12/32

For Secy)
2nd Asst)

13/12

13/12

DEWAN'S OFFICE
16 DEC 1932
3604

3872
13/12

18) The case is a very clear one & the appellant has been heard in all the lower Courts - There is no need to hear him again & his petn may be rejected -
∴ The file may be placed before the Dewan

16/12

Submitted
16/12/32

Dewan)

23/12/32

19/12

[illegible] accordingly. [illegible] [illegible] is also [illegible]

23/12

1932
SECT

No. 969 of 27.12.1932 to Mr V. R. Vasudeva Sastri Advocate - Chickpet

7

[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat Muz File No. 139 of 1932.

Serial No.

7 Bangalore city intimating that the appeal petition is rejected

Memo No 970 d 27.12.32 to the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding copy of the above –

8 Endorsement No 971 d 28.12.32 to Archak Narasimhachar of Sri Champaka-dhamaswami Temple Bannerghatta intimating that his petition is rejected

B
29/12

Note—Contn Sheet.

File No. of 193 .

General
Secre

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT
686
16 DEC 1932

FINANCIAL
14 DEC 1932
No.........

6

[illegible]
3/12

1/12

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] V. R. [illegible]

14.12.32

[illegible]

I [illegible] 1859 [illegible]

II [illegible] 1862 [illegible] (నకలు 1)

III 1868 [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] ద్వారా వారి
[illegible]
[illegible] (సంతకముచుండు)

[illegible]

16 12·32

Where please?
10/1

(1) The all. of 105 [illegible] is requested & the petitioner has already informed [illegible]
(2) This will be placed in the file & recorded after perusal]] A

ES
10/1

Hme 139-32 — 7 linked for ref. — Items [illegible] of 27-12-32 ~~[illegible]~~
[illegible] has been informed
to donate [illegible] has been [illegible]
That the ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] etc —

[illegible]
n/1

(for Secy)

A — this may be done

12/1/33

28/1

3/1

3/2

[illegible]

[illegible] రూకాయి

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

౨ [illegible]

౧౬ ।।౼≡ [illegible]

[illegible]

౧౨।౼= [illegible]

౧౯।౼=

౪।- ౨ [illegible]

౧౨।=౬ [illegible]

౪౪।।≡౧ [illegible]

౧ [illegible]

సాక్షులు [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

తే॥ 8.12.32

TWO RUPEES

213
MUZRAI

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muz.No. 5 of 1932-1933. Muz 139-32

Presented by Sri B Sringaranaya Rao. 17/8/32

- - -

Naranachar, Archak, Sri Champaka Dhama Swami - Temple, Banneraghatta, Anekal Taluk.		Appellant.
-:(VS):-		
Government of Mysore		Respondent.

M-85

***

1a Re: the change of patte of Survey Nos. 97, 176, 178, 214, 221, 224 and 32 of Banneraghatta Village from the personal name of the Archak to the name of the Deity.

The appellant abovenamed begs to prefer this appeal from the order of the Muzrai Commissioner in Muz. Apl. No. 5 of 30-31 on the following among other grounds :-

1. The petitioner begs to state that :

The Survey numbers referred to above were the personal properties of the Archak and his family members, from times immemorial. These lands were long in their possession as their own properties, which circumstance is supported and evidenced by the following grounds : -

(a) These lands are all fully assessed and the family members of the appellant, have been paying the full assessment every year and at no time their possession is questioned or disputed. This is quite apparent from the Government records.

(b). Further no mention has been made in any of the revenue records or village accounts to indicate , that they were Devadaya lands. Nor are these lands mentioned in the property list of the temple as Devadaya lands belonging to - the temple. Further, while the alleged grant of these lands was made in the year 1868, the grant was not made conditionally to the Archak, for the purpose of worshipping the Deity. The appellant also begs to bring to the notice of this Honourable Court, that no reference is made either in the Quit Rent Register or in the account No. 8 to show that the abovesaid lands were passed of as Temple Inam lands. In the year 1874-75 while the Inam Settlement was effected the Inam Commissioner also has not declared them to be Devadaya lands and the - person who was then in possession of the lands has not given any statement to that effect. Had the lands been Devadaya ones, the assessments due thereto had to be paid from the Temple funds and this was never done. In view of these circumstances, the appellant humbly submits , that the Lower Courts findings that they are Devadaya lands are quite baseless and unsubstantiated.

2. The appellant further submits that the procedure adopted by the Lower Courts in changing the patta is highly irregular, vitiated and not maintainable in law for the reaons Viz,

(1). Before changing the khata, the Khatedars consent was not taken and the question of long possession was not also considered. The

The Lower Courts have failed to follow the procedure prescribed in Sections 67, 68, 69 and 70 of the Land Revenue Code.

(ii). The appellant's references were not at all called for to establish his title and even formal enquiry was not held. The order has been passed Ex-parte and without giving adequate facility to the Appellant to represent his grievances.

3. As the lands have been in the long - possession and enjoyment of the appellant and his family members, they have got to be considered as lands alienated as all these years, the temple for which they are alleged to have been granted, was deprived of the benefits arising from these - lands long back. In the event of long alienations, Muzrai Regulation and the Chief Commissioner's Circular No. 266/1877 enjoins procedure to - resume the alienated lands or otherwise to deal with. The learned Deputy Commissioner has - failed to adopt this procedure. As such the procedure of the Lower Court is highly irregular and not maintainble.

4. On a simple presumption that the servants of the Government Institution will treat the Temple properties as their own, by long occupation, etc., the appellant presumes that the - order in question, has been passed. The appellant submits that the unfortunate coincidence, that the appellant and his ancestors were Archaks of the temple is no sufficient ground to convert their personal properties as Devadaya ones, even without questioning the bonafides of the claim

claim put forth on behalf of the institu
This summary way of disposing of a serious question of title to the valuable lands is highly prejudicial and detrimental to the interests in and title to the properties belonging to this Appellant.

5. Even assuming but not conceding that these lands belong to the temple in the face of the long possession and adverse title to the properties, the Muzrai Officers cannot convert the Khate without establishing the title of the Deity.

6. This appellant had also filed a petition before the Muzrai Commissioner praying for the review of the order passed in Muzrai; appeal No 5 of 30-31. The review application was also dismissed. Hence this appeal.

WHEREFORE, this appellant prays that this Honourable Court may be pleased to pass an order

(i). Reversing the order passed by the Muzrai Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner; and

(ii). Directing that the Khate of above-narrated Sur.numbers may be re-transferred to the name of the appellant from the name of the Deity.

****

Bangalore.
17-8-1932.

Appellant.

ADVOCATE FOR APPELLANT.

೨ TWO RUPEES ۲-روپے

Before the Govt of Mysore ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ
Bangalore

Muz: Appeal No
19೪೨-೪೩ನೇ ನಂಬರು

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್		ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್
Narayanachar	V.S.	Govt. of Mysore

V. R. Vasudeva Sastry, B.A., L.L.B.,
ಮ|| ರಾ|| .... *Advocate,* .... ಗೆ
Bangalore City.
B. Srinivasayangar

ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವುನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಪ್ಪೈರುವರುವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕುಮೊಬಲಗ ಸಹ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು, ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾನ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದೇನೆ

ತಾರೀಖು } ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜುಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ	ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದೇನೆ

ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಸ್ಥಳ:—ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ "ವಿದ್ಯಾವಿಲಾಸ ಬುಕ್‌ಡಿಪೋ" ಯವರಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತೆ

M. C. 27]

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸೀಮೆಯ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಕಮಿಷನರವರ
ಆಫೀಸಿನಿಂದ

ನಂ. [illegible] 79 / 32·33. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ತಾ॥ 21/7/32

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟು ಆನೇಕಲ್
ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಜಿಗಣಿ [illegible]
ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಶ್ರೀ ಚಂಪಕಧಾಮ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ [illegible]
[illegible] ಗೆ ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸು

ಇರೇಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ........ ~~ತಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡು~~ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

WD 01150—GPB—300—5-1-31

ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ನಂ.........
ತಾರೀಖು.........
ವಿಷಯ:—

ಶ್ರೀ ಚಂಪಕಧಾಮ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ
ಬಾಗಿಲಲ್ಲಿರುವ [illegible]
[illegible]
ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ರೈತರಲ್ಲ ನಿರಾಧಾರವಾಗಿರುವದರಿಂದ

ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲು ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದೆ

For [illegible]

ONE RUPEE

In the Court of the Muzrai Commissioner
in Mysore

Muzrai Appeal no 5 of 31-32

Appellant:- Naranachar Archak of Sri Champakadhamaswamy temple
Bannerghatta

Respondent:- Government

Appeal against the order of the Dy-Commissioner Bangalore district refusing to change the Khata of the lands belonging to Sri Champakadhama Swamy temple at Bannerghatta to the name of the petitioner

Facts of the case

3·Nos 32-97, 175
5, 214 and 221
Bannerghatta

From the records it is seen that the marginally noted lands were originally Service Inam lands belonging to the temple referred to above, that they were attached during Tippu Sultan's time and were levied with full assessment, that later on in June 1877 a proposal was made that the Khata of these lands should be made in the name of the deity and that the then Anekal Sub Division Officer the name of Valiwaddar being implied in therein and that this order was conformed. For several years after this, the Valiwaddar went paying the assessment and enjoying the Inam lands. But in the year 1920, the then archak Ramachar applied to the Sub Division and Taluk authorities requesting to be intimated of the circumstances under which the patta of lands which was in his name was transferred to the name of the deity. After enquiring into the matter the Sub-Division Officer ordered that an endorsement should be issued that nothing could be done as the matter had long before been disposed of, and the endorsement was accordingly issued on 28-12-23. About 4 years after this, when the Sub Division Officer Mr. Mokkhi visited the place, the temple Servants submitted their representation about the transfer of patta of the lands. Considering all the circumstances of the case, that Officer recommended that the tenure of the lands in question may be changed into Inam and jodi only collected thereon, thereby giving some relief to the petitioners. But this suggestion was not agreeable to the temple Servants who protested against the conversion of the lands into Inam their names alleging that the lands belonged their ancestors

On 30-6-30 and 11-12-30, the appellant (the present archak) prayed through petition to the Amildar that the lands in question might be restored to him. The Amildar submitted a report on 30-1-31 stating that it was impracticable in the interest of the institution to change the khata to petitioners name and was of opinion that the lands might be converted into Inam and a jodi of about Rs 40/- might be levied, in view of the good work that is being done by the temple servants and the popularity of the institution in consequence thereof. But the Deputy Commissioner ordered that it was not possible to make out the khata in the name of the appellant and an endorsement was accordingly issued to him. Hence the present appeal.

Appellant and his counsel present were heard on 26-3-32 and 8-4-32

Since 1876-77 and it is not possible now in favour of appellants such a step would only defeat the object of making the Estate in the name of the temple. The records produced do not help the appellant in anyway. The appeal is dismissed

Signed) S P Rajagopalachari
Madurai Commissioner

Copy applied for by Mr D Vasudeva Rao on 16-5-32
Copy ready 16-5-32
Copy delivered 17-5-32
No of words 610
Copying fees 0-10-0
Comparing fees 0-2-4
Copied by A Venkataramani
Compared by S Jayaramarao

Copy

M. Lakshmipathy
Head Munshi
Dy. Commr's Office

App II

Muz 139-32-2

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 470/Muz dt 15-9-32
Muz Appl Encl: 1 No 5 of 32-33

The accompanying Petition Registered No. 213 dated 17-8-32 received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Mr. N. Narasimhachar Archak of Sri Champaka Dhama Swami Temple – Bannerghatta Anekal Tk appealing against the order of the M.C in Muz Appl 5 of ~~31-32~~ 30-31 on the file of this Court re: the transfer of the Khata of lands etc to him

with complaint

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~ to the M.C for favour of the entire records connected with the case —

(Acknowledgement No. 472 dt 19.9.1932 to V. R. Vasudeva Sastri & B. Suryanarayana Rao. issued.)

By Order,

12/9

for Secretary.

BANGALORE,
10.9.1932

[P. T. O

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ..................................ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

....ಹೋಬಳಿ

....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ ಹುಕುಂ.

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ..............................

ಮರ್ಕೂಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು......................................ಬಗ್ಗೆ

....

....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order.

Secretary.

25

No. 471/Muz. 139-32-3 14-9-1932.

19th

The

The Superintendent,
Revenue Survey & Settlement,
(Inam Department).

I am directed to request you to be so good as to forward extract of Inam Registers in respect of lands ~~endowe~~ endowed to Sri Champakadha~~r~~ma a swami, Bannerghatta, Bangalore District. The old S.Nos. together with the current S.Nos. may kindly be noted.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for Financial Secretary to Government.
G.S

TD

SUBJECT S.L. ✓ ✓

Section Muz
File No. 135-32
Serial No. 3

Diary No. of letter replied to ....

No. 471/Muz

To

The Supdt Rev Survey & Settlement
(Inam Dept)

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the *193* .

Date of issue 19. 9. 1932

M.R. B. Muddukrishnappa.
Signed by

Sir,

I am directed to request that you will be so good as to ~~forward~~ a copy/extract of Inam Registers in respect of lands endowed to Sri Champaka Dhama Swami Bannerghatta - Bangalore Tq. The old S. Nos together with the current S. Nos may kindly be noted —

Dictated —
12/9/32 —
For Rev [illegible] —
[illegible]

List of enclosures ....

Copied by D.O. 4/19

Examined by ....

607

(2)

No. 126

3233. Enc: 1 copy.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
MYSORE REVENUE SURVEY,

Dated Bangalore, 24th September 1932.

Muz 139-32-5

27

FROM

S.P. Rajagopalachari, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
~~D. SRINIVASA IYENGAR, ESQ., B.A.,~~

Superintendent, Revenue Survey and
Settlements in Mysore

7/9/32

To

Financial Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

GENL. & REV. SEC
391
SEP 1932
MUZRAI

SIR,

As desired in your letter No.471/Muz. dated [illegible] September 1932, I have the honor to forward a copy of the Inam Register, pertaining to the grant of lands to Sri Champakadhamaswami at Bennerghatta, Anekal Taluk.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Superintendent.

Register Sheet No: 192

Taluk --- Anekal.

Village --- Bannergatti

೦೭೨ ೨೮ Register of Inams in the village of Bannerghatta

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fraction in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
		As per Taluk Jafti	account 1871	
			k. k. s.	
8	Devadaya	wet	0 – 0 – 11½	

of Jigani in the Taluk of Anekal

DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND

Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc., or liable to quit-rent, i. e., jodi, etc., amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
Beriz. Rs. as. p. 5 - 1 - 0	—	For pooje to Ramaswami swamy In the village temples in good order and poojay rendered daily.	—

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE.

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification o terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poorniah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
	Taluk Pymaish of 1806-7 Bannerghatta Ramaswami. K. K. P wet 0-0-11½ yatī	Taluk yatī account of 187. Champakadhamaswami K. K. P. Rs: as: ps. wet 0-6-11½ = 5-1-0.

of the Nandidrug

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Nil —	—	—	—

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	20
whole grant. Swadaya The land is set out on Candayam. To be struck off (Sd) B Rajagopalach Assistant 25-5-76	1 Struck off (Sd) R. A Cole Superintendent of I S 23-6-76 Compared " Copy " For Survey Superintendent

No. 316 Enc two Files OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.
32-33

Bangalore, 25th 193

Muz 139-32-6

FINANCIAL SECR.
28 NOV. 1932
No. 88

S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

GENL. & ... SECY.
601.
29. NOV. 1932
MUZRAI.

Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore
Financial ....*Department.*

SIR,

[illegible] Memo [illegible] Scrutiny [illegible] 1932 [illegible]

[illegible]

~~For~~
(absent from Hd Qrs)

969
Mu 139-32-7

26th December
27th

Mr.V.R.Vasudeva Sastri,
Advocate, Chickpet,
Bangalore City.

With reference to petition dated 17th August 1932 filed on behalf of his client Naranachar, Archak of Sri Champaka Dhama Swami Temple at Bannerghatta, Anekal Taluk, appealing against the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner in the matter of the change of patta of S.Nos. 97,176,178,214,221,224 and 321 of the said village - Mr.V.R.Vasudeva Sastri is informed that the petition is rejected.

By Order,

Sd/- S. Shamanna,
Financial Secretary to Government

Memo No. 970/Mu. d/27-12-32

Copy of the above is forwarded, with compliments, to the Muzrai Commissioner, with reference to hi letter No.316/32-33 dated 25th November 1932.

By Order,

K. Panduranga Rao
for Financial Secretary to Government.

28/12
S.R.-3

Section Muz

File No. 139 - 3

Serial No. 7

Diary No. of letter replied to ....

No. 969.

To

Mr. V. R. Vasudeva Sastri

Advocate. Chickpet.

Bangalore City.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 27/12/32

Signed by M. K. Panduranga Rao.

Re: the repl. to petn of 17.8.32 filed on behalf of his client one Narasimhachar, Sri Champakadhama Swami temple at Bannerghatta (Anekal Tk.) appealing against the orders of the D.C. in the matter of the change of katha of S. Nos 97, 176, 175, 214 (221, 224 & 32 of the said village) ~~etc. referred to in the petn~~, Mr. V. R. Vasudevasastri is informed that the petn is rejected.

List of enclosures ....

Copied by ....

Examined by ....

/Mog 9 27 T2

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to M. C. with ref.ce to his letter No 316/32-33 of 25/11/32. ~~The records received herewith on the subject are herewith returned.~~

These will be classified & are retained. The period for ? is over, when only for use them be got

28/11

B. O

23/11/32

for Secretary

28/11

WD 01723—GPB—6000—26-4-28

ನಂಬರು 971
Mys 135-32-8
ಇನ್ನು ಮೇಲೆ ನೀವು ಬರೆಯುವ ಕಾಗದ ಪತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ನಂಬರನ್ನು ದಯಯಿಟ್ಟು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿ

..........................ರ ಆಫೀಸು.

ತಾರೀಖು 28/12/1932.

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟ್.

[illegible]

ಸಂದರ್ಭ :— ನಿಮ್ಮ 17-8-32 ನೆಯ ಮರ್ಕ್ಯಂ [illegible]

ವಿಷಯ·—

[illegible]

ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಂಡ 1 ನೆಯ ನಂಬರ್ ಕಲಮಿಗೆ ಗಮನಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ರುಜು [illegible]

ಹುದ್ದೆಯ ಹೆಸರು [illegible]

DP

*

1 ~~ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆಯನ್ನು ನೆರವೇರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ~~ [illegible]

~~2. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು / ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು~~ ....ಗೆ .... ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

3. ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿನ .... ನೆಯ ಮರ್ಕ್ಯಂ .... ನೆಯ ನಂಬರಿಗೆ ಗಮನಕೊಡವೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೊರಿದೆ.

4. .... ನೆಯ ಮರ್ಕ್ಯಂ .... ನೆಯ ನಂಬರನ್ನು ಕಂಡು ಹಿಡಿಯಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ; ಅದರ ಒಂದು ನಕಲನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

5. ಮಲಫೂಫಿಗಳು ತಲುಪಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

6. ಅರ್ಜಿಯು—

(i) ವಿಧಾಯಕವಾದ ನಮೂನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಡದೆ,

ಅಥವಾ (ii) ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು ಹಚ್ಚಿಸಲ್ಪಡದೆ,

ಅಥವಾ (iii) ವಿಧಾಯಕವಾದ ವಾಯಿದೆಯೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡದೆ,

ಅಥವಾ (iv) ಯಾವ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಪೀಲು ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದೋ ಅಥವಾ ಫಿರ್ಯಾದು ತರಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದೋ ಆ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಒಂದು ನಕಲಿನ ಸಮೇತ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲ್ಪಡದೆ, ಇರುವ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತ, ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ವಾಪಸುಮಾಡಿದೆ.

7. ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು .... ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರ್ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಾಪಸುಮಾಡಿದೆ.

8. (a) ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಬರೆವಣಿಗೆಯು ಓದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾರದಹಾಗೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ,

(b) ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ.

(c) ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಅನುಚಿತವಾದ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದನು ವಾಪಸು ಮಾಡಿದ

* ಕಾರಣಗಳು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವನ್ನು ಸಂಕ್ಷೇಪವಾಗಿ ನಮೂದಿಸತಕ್ಕದು,